

REMARKS

With this amendment, claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Independent claims 1-4 have been amended. The Applicant has carefully and thoughtfully considered the Office Action and the comments therein. For the reasons given below, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

In the Office Action on pages 2-5, claims 1-3, 7-12, and 15-20 are alleged to be anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,093,280 to Ke et al (hereinafter Ke). Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Ke for at least the following reason.

Ke does not disclose, "said at least one interface processing device [] adapted to forward **information to configure** at least one of said at least one reconfigurable processing device and said at least one interface processing device, received by said at least one interface processing device, to said at least one authentication processing device to verify that the information came from an authorized source," as recited in claim 1. Instead Ke discloses a method and apparatus for processing data packets transferred over a network. Ke, col. 1, l. 65 through col. 2, l. 1. The apparatus disclosed in Ke includes, for example, a firewall device 305 comprising a firewall engine, an authentication engine, a controller, and several VPNs. Ke, col. 2, l. 1-21, col. 6, 57 through col. 7, l. 32, and FIGS. 3 and 9. When a data packet is received by the firewall device 305 the controller detects the packet and communicates with the other engines via a bus. Ke, col. 7, l. 7-9. The controller identifies which VPN destination address and the policies that are associated with the VPN destination. Ke, col. 7, l. 16-20. If these policies include firewall policies or authentication policies, the controller calls the firewall engine or the authentication engine which apply the appropriate set of policies to the data packet itself. Ke, col. 7, l. 20-28. A user interface is provided to allow a user to set different policies for the different engines. Ke, col. 6, l. 64-66. **A user then sets firewall policies for the firewall and authentication policies for the authentication engine.** Ke, col. 7, l. 1-6. The firewall engine and authentication engine then apply these policies when sent

data packets by the controller. Ke, col. 7, l. 1-32. In contrast, claim 1 recites an “said at least one interface processing device [] adapted to forward **information to configure** at least one of said at least one reconfigurable processing device and said at least one interface processing device, received by said at least one interface processing device, to said at least one authentication processing device to verify that the information came from an authorized source.” Therefore, Ke does not disclose an “said at least one interface processing device [] adapted to forward **information to configure** at least one of said at least one reconfigurable processing device and said at least one interface processing device, received by said at least one interface processing device, to said at least one authentication processing device to verify that the information came from an authorized source,” as recited in claim 1.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); see M.P.E.P § 2131. Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Ke for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2 and 3 are believed to be allowable, at least, for being dependent from an allowable claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claims 2 and 3 be withdrawn and that claims 2 and 3 be allowed.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is patentable over Ke for at least the following reason.

Ke does not disclose “performing an authentication process on said received information if said received information **does not comprise data** for transmission,” as recited in claim 1. Instead, as previously discussed, Ke discloses methods and apparatus for processing **data packets** transferred over a network in which a user sets policies for a firewall engine and an authentication engine. Ke, col. 1, l. 65 through col. 2, l. 1 and col. 4, l. 42-46. A user then sets firewall policies for the firewall and authentication policies for the authentication engine via a user interface. Ke, col. 4, l. 23-27 and col. 7, l. 1-6. The firewall engine and authentication engine then apply these policies

when sent data packets by the controller. Ke, col. 7, l. 1-32. Ke does not disclose treatment of information other than data packets. In contrast, claim 1 recites an “performing an authentication process on said received information if said received information **does not comprise data** for transmission.” Ke, therefore, does not disclose “performing an authentication process on said received information if said received information **does not comprise data** for transmission,” as recited in claim 1.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); see M.P.E.P § 2131. Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, it is submitted that amended claim 7 is not anticipated by Ke for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 recites subject matter similar to that recited in claim 7, which Applicants believe is allowable over Ke as discussed above. Therefore, Applicants believe claim 15 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn and that claim 15 be allowed.

Dependent claims 8-12 and 16-20 are believed to be allowable, at least, for being dependent from allowable claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claims 8-12 and 16-20 be withdrawn and that claims 8-12 and 16-20 be allowed.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

On pages 5-7, the Action rejects claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ke in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,944,706 to Schain et al. (hereinafter Schain). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Regarding claim 4, Ke and Schain, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention for at least the following reasons.

First, Independent claim 4 recites subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1, which Applicants believe is allowable over Ke as discussed above.

Second, Schain does not overcome the failings of Ke, as described above. Hence, the combination of Ke and Schain fails to disclose “said interface processing device [] adapted to forward information to configure at least one of said reconfigurable processing device and said interface processing device, received by said apparatus, to said authentication processing device to verify that the information came from an authorized source,” as recited in claim 4. Therefore, Applicants believe claim 4 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn and that claim 4 be allowed.

Dependent claims 5 and 6 are believed to be allowable, at least, for being dependent from allowable claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claims 5 and 6 be withdrawn and that claims 5 and 6 be allowed.

On pages 8-9, the Action rejects claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ke in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,280 to Brownell (hereinafter Brownell). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.


Dependent claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 are believed to be allowable, at least, for being dependent from allowable claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 be withdrawn and that claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: 1/25/2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James R. Burdett
Registration No.: 31,594

Kyle D. Petaja
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant